

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-40 are pending in the subject application. Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 21-24, 27-33, 35, 37, 39 and 40 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to an earlier election requirement. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 26, 34 and 36 have been rejected under 35 USC 102, as anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Godkin et al. (USP 4,808,955) – claims 1, 3, 5, 10-11, and 26, or as anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Zhao (USP 5,808,379) – claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 34 and 36. Claims 2, 12-20, 25 and 38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that Claims 2, 12-20, 25 and 38 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Amendments to the claims:

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite that the first portion of the core includes an end face and a "cavity" formed in the end face of the first portion, and the second portion of the core includes an end face and a "cavity" formed in the end face of the second portion. Several examples of such cavities in the end faces are provided in Figs. 4, 5 and 10 of the subject application.

Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to more clearly recite the hemispherical shape of the cavity formed in the respective, recited faces. Several examples of such hemispherical shape are provided in Figs. 4 and 5 of the subject application

Rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 26, 35 and 36 -- 35 USC 102:

In his application of Godkin and Zhao to the rejected claims, the Examiner has asserted that each teaches "first and second portions, each including an end face and a cavity." For Godkin, the Examiner points to first and second portions "at 46, at 58," and cavity "near 48-49. For Zhao, the Examiner points to "figure 5" as

teaching that "the core includes first and second portions," and to "44" as "each including an end face and a cavity." Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's analysis of Godkin and Zhao.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Godkin nor Zhao include cavities formed in each of the end faces of first and second portions of a core. The Examiner is attempting to use the space between end faces in each of the reference to find the recited cavities, however the end faces are clearly planar and have no cavities. Apparently, the Examiner is interpreting the space which is formed between the respective end faces as representing the "cavity" of the claims. However, it is respectfully submitted that such cavity is not "formed in" the end face of each of the first and second portions, as recited in independent claims 1 and 34. Independent claims 1 and 34 are therefore allowable over Godkin and over Zhao.

Claims 3, 5, 10-11, and 26, as dependent from allowable claim 1, and claim 36, as dependent from allowable claim 34, are therefore respectfully submitted to be allowable.

Further, objected-to claims 2, 12-20, 25 and 38, as dependent from either allowable claim 1 or allowable claim 34, are therefore respectfully submitted to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance, and the Examiner's indication to that end is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER US LLP

Dated: May 4, 2007

By:



Gerald T. Sekimura  
Reg. No. 30,103  
Attorney for Applicant

DLA Piper US LLP  
153 Townsend Street, Suite 800  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Telephone: 415-836-2576  
Facsimile: 415-836-2501

Customer No.: 29585